

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

Dennis R. Brock,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:15–cv–3050

v.

Judge Michael H. Watson

**Attorney General of the State
of Ohio.**

Defendant.


OPINION AND ORDER

On December 29, 2015, Magistrate Judge King, upon an initial screen of the instant complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e), 1915A, issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending the Court dismiss this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. R&R, ECF No. 7.

In so doing, she found that: (1) the *Rooker-Feldman* abstention doctrine divests this Court of subject matter jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff’s claim challenging state court decisions characterizing him as a vexatious litigator; (2) Plaintiff fails to state a claim that Ohio Revised Code § 2323.52 is unconstitutional because it impedes his right to pursue a habeas corpus action; and (3) to the extent Plaintiff alleges that Ohio Revised Code § 2323.52 violates the Ohio Constitution, the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear that claim. *Id.* at 2–5.

Plaintiff objects. ECF No. 9. The Court has thoroughly reviewed Plaintiff's objections and finds them meritless. Accordingly, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's objection, ECF No. 9, **ADOPTS** the R&R, and dismisses this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


MICHAEL H. WATSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT